

**REMARKS**

Claims 6 and 14 are all the claims currently pending in this Application.

**Request to Consider Previously-Submitted References**

Applicants note that despite request to do so, the Examiner has still not provided Applicants with a signed and initialed copy of the modified PTO/SB/08 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement of January 13, 2005. Applicants enclose herewith a stamped filing receipt indicating that the IDS, along with references and a European Search Report, were filed on January 13, 2005. Applicants also submit an additional copy of the PTO/SB/08 for the convenience of the Examiner.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner return a signed and initialed copy of the PTO/SB/08 with the next Office communication.

**Claim Objections and Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

First, claims 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly based on a disclosure which is not enabling. Each of claims 6 and 14 recite only a single RAKE combiner corresponding to each of the processing blocks. The Examiner asserts that page 23, lines 7-12 of the specification states that RAKE combiners 26, 36, and 44 provide a control field necessary for decoding and that RAKE combiners 27, 37, and 45 provide a data field necessary for decoding, and therefore, the claims are deficient in failing to recite at least first and second RAKE combiners for each reception processing block. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's understanding of page 23, lines 7-12 is mistaken. This portion of the specification explains that RAKE combiners 26, 36, and 44, carry out RAKE combining of the

control field, and also store some information necessary for decoding in memories 11-13. The information necessary for decoding stored by RAKE combiners 26, 36, and 44 may be format information for a data field. RAKE combiners 27, 37, and 45 carry out RAKE combining of the data field and also store information in the memories 11-13. Therefore, there is nothing in the specification that states that RAKE combiners 27, 37, and 45 are necessary for decoding.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the §112, second paragraph rejection of claims 6 and 14 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Second**, claims 6 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner asserts that there is no written description of the decoder reading out signals having a high priority *based on the service type of the received signals*. Applicants respectfully submit that the specification supports this limitation.

Page 19, line 29 through page 20, line 4 recites: “the CDMA signal is divided to the packet reception processing block 2, the high-speed data reception processing block 3 and the voice/low-speed data reception processing block 4 depending on the service type thereof so that a processing suitable for the service type can be conducted in each block.” In other words, the signals are allocated to one of processing block 2, processing block 3, and processing block 4 *based on the service type of the received signals*.

Further, memory 11 corresponds to packet reception processing block 2, memory 12 corresponds to high-speed data reception processing block 3, and memory 13 corresponds to voice/low-speed data reception processing block 4, as shown in Figure 8. In other words, the

signals are directed to one of memory 11, memory 12, and memory 13 *based on the service type of the received signals*.

The decoder reads out the signals according to one of memory 11, memory 12, and memory 13. Therefore, it is clear that the decoder reads out the signals *based on the service type of the received signals*.

Thus, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 6 and 14 under §112, first paragraph be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Third**, claims 6 and 14 stand objected to do to informalities of language. With this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 6 and 14, as shown, for purposes of clarity.

In view of these amendments, Applicants request that this objection to claims 6 and 14 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Fourth**, claims 6 and 14 stand objected to due to the use of the phrase “high priority.” The Examiner asks, the received signals have high priority with respect to what? Regarding this objection Applicants submit that it would be clear to one of skill in the art based on the specification that the received signals have high priority with respect to the other received signals; in other words, certain received signals have higher priority than other received signals.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that this objection to claims 6 and 14 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Laura Moskowitz  
Registration No. 55,470

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 17, 2006